

城裡的人想逃出來 城外的人想衝進去

前些時，有幾位社友去西藏旅遊，回來發表了幾篇遊記，筆者剛剛從大陸旅遊回來，也發表一些自己的一些旅遊觀感吧。我喜歡把去大陸旅遊比喻是吃燒餅油條，久不吃又想吃，但吃了以後又總會有些反胃和不舒適的感覺。

我和內子二人，擬定一個旅遊行程，洛杉磯飛北京，辦一些私事後次日飛武漢，參觀黃鶴樓和東湖公園然後坐動車去宜昌，搭乘總統八號遊輪上行到重慶，遊大足石刻，乘坐高鐵去成都，參加樂山大佛和峨眉山旅遊，之後坐飛機回北京再回來美國，全程兩個星期。

武漢，成都，重慶和三峽，筆者個人早在三十年前就去過，那時修大壩正在熱烈討論爭議中，當時筆者就許願，希望大壩工程修好，要重遊一次三峽，這次的安排，算是完成了個人的願望。當年搭乘的是渝江輪，除了幾間有床鋪的二等艙外，其餘是二等艙，乘客們人擠人躺在甲板上，好像被販賣的黑奴一樣；如今的總統遊輪，客房如同旅館房間一樣，裡面廁所俱全，非常舒適，船上有大餐廳，劇院，健身房，游泳池，遊客大多數是大陸各省來的，外賓人數可能不及兩成，中國人三十年來，從貧窮困苦到富裕小康，由三峽過客可以看出一些端倪。

三峽大壩工程的宏偉令人震撼，三峽人家和神農溪風景的秀麗令人神往，白帝城的歷史背景，鄧都鬼城的傳奇故事，三峽

◎范湘濤

四天遊確實不虛此行。但大壩對生態環境的影響是確定的，至少你我再也沒有機會去感受「兩岸猿聲啼不住，輕舟已過萬重山」那種詩情畫意了。黃鶴樓，大足，樂山，峨眉山的風光，如果讀者們有興趣可以去百度一下，筆者就不一一陳述了，因為那些不是我寫文章的重點，我想寫的主要是一些旅遊的感受。

中國這些年推行的扶貧工作，少數民族受益是顯著的，這次旅程中，從山峽景區內的土家族，峨眉山區的彝族人民交談中，知道他們心裏對中共是感恩戴德的。少數民族多數是農民，中共建黨之初，就是要解決中國的農民問題，扶貧項目可能是這個政策的延伸吧。

有句俗話，「江山易改，本性難移」，中國人民素養的進步是遠遠跟不上整個國家在硬體方面的進步；講話的尖酸，看人的白眼，爭先恐後，喧嘩吵鬧，仍然隨處可見，但可喜的現象是年輕一代，言行舉止較前幾年有了很大進步，禮貌，讓座，當自願者在街頭服務已經成為風氣，中國成為文明社會的日子應該不會太遠了。

中國大陸有一個奇特現象，就是一般民族主義高漲，認為「老子天下第一」，但也有很多表現非常崇洋，小黃毛頭到處都是，許多人身上T恤上印的是不知所云的洋文，真的是人各有志？每次來中國，我都會想到錢鐘書「圍城」裡的那句名言：「城裡的人想逃出來，城外的人想衝進去」，是的，

有許多外國人到中國旅遊經商闖天下，但更多的中國人，無論窮富，都想盡辦法要到國外去安身樂命，不願留在國內做「中國夢」，這種現象的確有相當程度的諷刺性。從「圍城」想到「危城」，中國雖然已經是超級大國，但內有藏獨，疆獨，臺獨，港獨等分裂勢力，外有西方國家的虎視眈眈，危機四伏，如果不靠老共的堅強組織和它強大動員能力，中國是沒有辦法繼續保持進步強大的。

離開大陸和臺灣久了，回到那兒總有點既熟悉又陌生的感覺，每次到大陸和臺灣，都有一種同樣的感覺，就是那兩個地方的人都沒有把我們當自己人看待；回到我們落地生根的美國才有一份真正投入的安逸，但除了納稅投票之外，又總覺得美國並沒有完全接受我們。像我們這一群在大陸出生，在臺灣成長，在美國終老的所謂「最後的內地人」，被認為是失落的一代，但筆者並不認為我們失落，反而認為我們是最幸運的一代，幼小時逃離大陸，躲過了共產黨的三反五反，在國民黨統治下，在臺灣享受了苦中有樂的青春歲月，在美國最鼎盛的大時代（great society）來到美國打拼，上天給我們的安排是一個接一個的好運；我們這群三不像的人，使我聯想到有一個三不像的神獸「麒麟」，我們這失落一代，何不稱自己為神人呢？據說麒麟出現處必有祥瑞，憑著我們對大陸，臺灣和美國的感念和熱愛，以我們神人的視野作出努力，應該對三地的互相理解會有神助，也許會為美國，大陸和臺灣帶來一片祥瑞吧。

川普先生 美國人並不愚笨

◎濱楠

北美自由貿易協定是共和黨布希總統，而不是民主黨主政者，於1992年跟墨西哥和加拿大簽定的。美國與墨西哥貿易額從1993年的3,337億增加至2011年的12,000億。美國全國總商會把此歸功於北美自貿協定。一個對全國最著名經濟學家們意見調查顯示，95%的被調查者同意美國人民受益於北美自貿協定。

目前美國失業率的新低，說明了北美自貿沒導至美國人民大幅失業。而這項互利共贏的協定也大幅擴大了墨西哥中等收入階層，從而減少了由墨西哥進入美國的非法移民人數。

相信我，川普先生，美國人並不愚笨也不是傻子，美國有全世最頂尖的知庫和談判高手，政府怎麼會做出如你所說損己利人之事？同時，你跟你數度破產債主們討價還價的本事，怎可與美國國際談判頂尖高手的能力相比？

墨西哥非法移民在美國從事美國人不願做的低級勞動工作如農場臨時工，旅館清潔工等辛苦低收入工作。最好的例子包括在川普賭場旅館打工的清潔工和建造川普大樓時所用的雜役工。也有非常多的他們加入軍隊在海外為美國出生入

死。相信我，川普先生，美國人並不愚笨，美國政府知道墨西哥廉價勞工對美國經濟和軍事的貢獻，從而默許他們在美國的居留。

於2001年，也是在共和黨布希任內，世界人口最多的中國，經過漫長的談判和跨過了嚴格的要求和規定，加入了世界貿易組織。美國的批准，是因為中國是對美國貨物和服务商品需求最多快的國家。美國的國策是把低勞工密集的製造業移往亞洲，而從高產產業和服务業獲取更優厚的利潤。雖然在貿易帳面上中國享有巨大的順差，但美國公司仍然從中獲取重大的利益，比如，正像華爾街日報所指出，在價值數百元蘋果手機中，中國只從中得到幾十元的勞工收益，同樣的，川普先生在他公司從中國生產的領帶中獲得了優厚的利潤，而中國勞工只得到微薄的酬勞。

相信我，川普先生，美國人並不像你說的那樣愚笨，低薪低薪製造業的外移，大大降低和轉移了環境污染，消費者享受了物美價廉的產品，通貨膨脹得以控制而中下層收入民眾的生活水準得以提高。

相信我，川普先生，據有全世界最強大軍事、政治、經濟和金融力量的美

國不可能被中國「強姦」歷經多任民主和共和黨政府，長達廿餘年。相信我，川普先生，推行貿易保護主義和大幅提高關稅會像絕大多數經濟學家所相信的那樣，導至全球貿易戰爭和帶來世界經濟大蕭條。

相信我，川普先生，如果一個沒有才能，心懷種族偏見的人，僅靠機會主義和民粹技術成為美國總統，將會給美國和世界帶來巨大的災難。

抗議臺灣代辦處

◎尹紀穎

最近臺灣的蔡政府一連串倒行逆施，令人心痛：

1. 禁止港澳陸人員進入民國史館，研究民國史；島內人民則須先提出申請，被通過後方能使用史館。民國史是革命先烈用鮮血鑄成的。中華民族每一成員皆應有權知曉那段史實。何況歷史屬於全人類最珍貴的文化。

2. 處罰去太平島爭取主權，證明是島非礁的漁民。蔡政府主動放棄主權，計畫將島租借給美日作為補給駐紮之用，使美日更能有效對抗大陸。國家每寸土地皆為先民流血

論 中 壇 美 US-CHINA FORUM
網址 http://www.us-chinaforum.org 投稿信箱: uschinaforum138@gmail.com

中美論壇社 主編
社務委員：張紹遷 周友道 水秉和 張一飛 陳立家 陳憲中 馬在莊 佟秉宇 高志雲 范湘濤 張文基 蔡社長
刊例設計 劉學武
每星期六出刊 第165期

推進中美相互瞭解合作 促成海峽兩岸和平統一 倡導和諧平等多元世界

兩岸和平 不容破壞

◎謝芷生

台灣520政黨輪替後，新政權推動了一系列引發爭議的政策。舉其要者有1. 不肯承認「九二共識」。2. 擱淺或遲滯服貿貨貿協議，全面削弱兩岸經貿互動。3. 推翻課綱微調，堅持文化台獨。4. 假借「轉型正義」追殺並凍結國民黨黨產。5. 默認日本「沖之鳥」200海裡專屬經濟海域，討好日本。6. 消極因應南海九段線及太平島主權，討好美國。7. 推動窒礙難行的「南向政策」，轉移台商西進勢頭等等，真是不勝枚舉。種種倒行逆施，令人瞠目結舌，許多人為此義憤填膺，舉辦了種種抗議活動，抒發心中憤慨，致使凱達格蘭大道上抗議人群一波接著一波。台北過去何曾有過這麼熱鬧的場面。

九三遊行示威，筆者人正在台北，由於好奇，更基於對受到不公待遇軍教人員的同情，我冒暑熱到凱道參觀了這場波瀾壯闊的活動。只見萬人空巷，人頭滾滾。最令我感到意外的是，參加活動的竟幾乎全是本省人，外省人難於其間，可說寥寥無幾。不禁要問，外省人都到哪裡去了？但仔細一想，就明白了。過去外省人中老兵佔了很大比例，他們逝去後，由於沒有成家，後繼無人，因此台灣的外省人已大幅縮減了。但無須擔心，今日台灣本省人早已融為一體，對於不稱職的所謂本土政權，本外省人都會一致反對。

年初台灣大選，許多人眼看國民黨必敗無疑，而憂心忡忡。我出身國民黨家庭，不自覺地要為國民黨加油打氣，一連寫了好幾篇文章力挺洪秀柱。但後來國民黨內部自亂陣腳，反對洪秀柱的兩岸主張，硬拉她下馬。失望痛心之餘，只好放棄不管了。其實

國民黨選戰必敗，大家心裡早有數。國民黨之敗固敗在經濟長期低迷不振，但最根本的原因，則在於其反獨旗幟不夠鮮明，立場不夠堅定。就拿課綱微調一例來說吧，執政八年竟無法予以貫徹，新政權一上台就悍然將其廢止了。須知，欲亡其國者，必先亡其史。台獨是何其心狠手辣。因此，即使他們接受了「九二共識」，若不肯導正台獨課綱，也是虛與委蛇罷了，統獨仍難逃最後攤牌的命運。大家對此應有所認識，並有心理準備。

表面上看來，似乎台灣島上台獨氣焰正熾，不利於兩岸的和平發展。但事物一旦發展到了極限，往往就會逆向發展了。過去國民黨長期執政，即使2000年第一次政黨輪替後，國民黨在立法院席次仍佔絕對多數，實質上並沒有真正下野。因此，扁政權施政的優劣，便很難完全與國民黨的影響撇清關係，致使選民無法徹底認清台獨政權的本質與真面目。既然國民黨在面對台獨長期挑戰中，已招架無力，回天乏術，不如讓它徹底垮台，讓台獨勢力全面執政，如此選民才有機會看清其本質，識破台獨主張純屬謊言，寸步難行。

9月17日台灣八個非綠營縣市首長，為民請命，聯袂前往大陸訪問，拓展經貿關係，獲得台灣內部普遍喝采。這是目前島內政經情勢已走到極限，即將反彈的明顯信號。台獨政權才執政四個月，就讓人民看破了其只會搞台獨，不顧兩岸和平發展，不顧民生經濟的本質。人民再不起來自救，放任台獨繼續胡作非為下去，不但生機將陷入困境，兩岸和平也將遭受破壞，這是兩岸人民都絕不會答應的。

The Real Effect of the 2016 Presidential Debate

Abstract

The first Presidential debate did not seem to have created much effect on the undecided voters, but the mainstream media would have you thought otherwise. There are two more debates to come but if the debates would still stay at substanceless level then voters would be vulnerable to money controlled media and could not make a good decision. Moreover, a candidate especially a career politician could not be pinned down on any policy with these meatless debates. In this article, we suggest to voters to use a "Ten Dollar Challenges A Million Dollar Ad" strategy to pin down candidates on their positions and future actions.

The first 2016 presidential debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton took place on September 26 at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y. Since the two candidates are both from the New York State, it is logical that the first debate took place in New York State even though the Republican Party and Donald Trump know very well that New York State is a democratic state and all its universities are liberal leaning towards Democratic Party. Hofstra University is no exception. Be that it might, the first debate took place smoothly with Lester Holt of the Washington Post as the moderator. The format was a free exchange debate following each candidate given a two minute statement on a number of issues allotted to six 15 minute time slots.

I watched the entire debate. My impression was that neither candidate made any statement that we had not heard before. There was no new substance, actually hardly any substance at all, a very disappointing presidential debate. The moderator's questions had no depth and the candidates did not volunteer offering any in-depth discussion. Trump maintained his usual style and Clinton were very prepared in make-up, notes, and mannerism, carrying big smiles all the time whether she was quizzed or attacked, for example, with her outstanding issues such as the erasure of thirty thousand plus of her emails from her private email server which she was not supposed to use for doing her job as the Secretary of State. Donald did remark that Hillary did not have the temperament to be the President but Hillary tactically handled his accusation with her big smile.

Post debate, the mainstream almost unanimously wanted you (the audience) to believe that Hillary won the debate hands down. I was wondering, Hillary won by what, a calmer poise than her usual stance or

Mainstream and Organic Views
Dr. Wordman

her emotionless big smile? Winning a presidential debate must win by content, message and intellectual political substance, but we heard none. Did we hear the difference between reducing taxes (Donald) and raising taxes (Hillary) in how exactly it will be implemented through what tax system, how exactly the government budget will be affected, what exactly the impact it will have on what people and be exhibited where? We heard none of that other than Hillary saying: read my website. Shouldn't a president be able to articulate any issue and solution to the public in speeches?

As time moved on, more sensible analytical comments about the presidential debate should emerge, at least for the sake of or the benefit of the next debate to be held on October 9th at the University of St Louis, St Louis, MO. In this column, I have commented before about how citizens especially Chinese Americans should vote on issues and not by party line. In American politics, party doctrines have become so politically correct and far from the politician's actual deeds (reality of their actions not their words). The voters must watch, examine and predict the politicians' deeds not from their words; of course, that is very hard for voters especially when the mainstream media dwell mostly on the 'political correctness' rather than evaluating on past behaviors and performances of a politician. It seems that the mainstream media are more eager to preach than to investigate to give the public the materials to watch, examine and predict who may be a better candidate.

So what can voters do? Yes, there are some organic media which are trying to do an honest job by refusing to accept 'political' donations or to be bought by 'Ad money'. But we all know it is hard to find organic media totally free from money hand. So what shall voters do? Unfortunately, my answer is also to use money, but I am talking about small amount of money to counter the big money like millions of dollars spent on TV, newspapers, radio, etc. I may have mentioned this before, but I will get into more specific here for this Presidential election so we may make a wise decision in selecting our next President. Let's face it, we know politics are influenced by money so we have no choice but to join the game, but we must use our money wisely, based

on an old idiom, "Four Ounce Tips Over Two Thousand Pounds" or translated in today's language, "Ten Dollar Contribution Challenges A Million Dollar Ad". Is this possible? I think so, if more people understand how to do it. The method isn't difficult and can be illustrated by a few examples below.

If you were a Sanders supporter before, you are now facing the choice between Hillary and Trump, all you need to do is sending Hillary a ten dollar (or twenty five) contribution with a number of questions on the check demanding answers before they cash the check. For example, you support Bernie's free tuition idea, ask how exactly Hillary can realize that now she is in favor of it. Another example, Hillary wants to increase taxes on the 1%, ask her which tax avenue will be used and how much are to be gained and which loop holes must be plucked in order to realize the effect she claimed? If Hillary cashes the check without addressing the questions then you should demand a refund through public media if necessary. If Hillary returns the check, at least you know she is honest and won't be able to keep her promises.

Likewise, if you (say, a Ted Cruz supporter) want to ascertain whether Trump is truly conservative, you can send him a small check with a few questions. Now that Ted Cruz announced his support for Trump with six reasons and Trump has welcomed Cruz's support, then you can challenge Trump on any of the six reasons, asking him which one he will support, pinning him down so to speak. Another example, now Paul Ryan is openly supporting Trump, you may send a small check to Donald with a question: how is he going to work with Ryan, ask him to name some potential cabinet appointees. The above questions are just suggested examples, surely you should ask your own questions. If you are really concerned with America's future, our democracy, we, the majority, must counter the big money which has control over the major media to rig the election. We, the majority or any voting bloc must use the "ten dollar against million" strategy to steer the politic correctness to the truth. I believe that a half million voters sending their questions with ten dollars will have a bigger impact on the candidate than a five million dollar individual donor or money group.

Send the ten dollars by certified mail and demand a reply for cashing your check has a tremendous power, you will find out more about the candidate than reading news from the mainstream media. If a candidate would refuse to take your money, it represents an answer as well. Send these answers out through public or organic media to amplify the message. In a true democracy, the candidates must be accountable to the majority of voters.